

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWING

Please accept the enclosed replacement drawing sheet 1/5 in which the reference numeral "26" in Fig. 1 has been corrected to read --2b-- as described, for example, on page 4, line 1, of Applicant's specification.

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102 and §103

Claims 14-19 and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by (lacking novelty over) Oiwa (JP '817).

Dependent claim 20 (20/14) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Oiwa (JP '817).

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) requires that Oiwa disclose, either expressly or inherently, each limitation of each of claims 14-19 and 21-26, or in other words, that each of claims 14-19 and 21-26 be **readable** on Oiwa's disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that clearly such is not the case here with respect to the **amended** claims 14-19 and 21-26 (claims 22, 24 and 25 have been canceled without prejudice).

More specifically, Oiwa does **not** disclose, or even suggest, the subject matter of amended claim 14 wherein a second heat sink (32) is disposed so as to be separated radially outward from the first heat sink (30), as shown, for example, in Applicant's Fig. 1.

With the claimed arrangement, as indicated by arrow A in Fig. 1, external air, that has entered through the suction aperture (2a), passes through the space between the first heat sink (30) and the second heat sink (32), and is discharged externally through the discharge aperture (2b), thereby suppressing temperature increases in the first unidirectional conducting element bodies (31) and the second unidirectional conducting element bodies (31).

In **contrast**, Oiwa in Fig. 3 discloses that a second heat sink (42) is disposed so as to be separated axially outward from the first heat sink (41).

Thus, since claims 14-19, 21, 23 and 26 clearly are **not readable** on Oiwa, Applicant respectfully submits that Oiwa is **incapable of anticipating** these claims, whereby Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) requires that Oiwa teach, or at least suggest, all of the limitations of claim 20 (20/14).

The Examiner asserts that dependent claim 20 (20/14) discloses all of the claimed subject matter "but that said first and second heat sinks are made of aluminum". Applicant has explained above the deficiencies in Oiwa's disclosure relative to the amended parent claim 14. Thus, since Oiwa does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of dependent claim 20 (20/14), Applicant respectfully submits that Oiwa is **incapable of rendering obvious** the subject matter of the dependent claim 20.

In summary, then, and for the reasons presented above, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 103(a), and to find the application to be in condition for allowance with all of claims 14-21, 23 and 26. (In this regard, Applicant notes that the Office Action Summary erroneously refers to pending claims 1-26, rather than to 14-26.)

Applicant files concurrently herewith a Petition (with fee) for an Extension of Time of one month. Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/573,199

maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and/or § 1.17 necessary to keep this application pending in the Patent and Trademark Office or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

/John H. Mion/

John H. Mion
Registration No. 18,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
(202) 663-7901

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 12, 2008